REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13-21, 23-25, 27-31 and 33-60 are pending in the application. Claims 1-11, 13-21, 23-25, 27-31 and 33-60 stand rejected. Applicants herein amend claims 1, 21, 37, 43, 49, 55. No new matter is added. As a result claims 1-11, 13-21, 23-25, 27-31 and 33-60 are pending.

Objection to the Specification

The specification of the Application stands object to due to alleged informalities. Applicants have amended the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to the specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 1 – 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 13 – 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over US Patent Application Anglin et al., US Application Publication No. 2004-0199521 ("Anglin"), in view of Chang et al., US Patent No. 6,578,046 ("Chang"), Goodwin et al. US Patent No. 6,199,195 ("Goodwin"), and Nelson US Patent No. 7,158,962 ("Nelson").

In an Office Action dated June 4, 2007 the Examiner stated that Nelson teaches "wherein said Item Folder are themselves Items ... [and] said Items can be modified via any Item Folder they belong to" (Office Action, dated June 4, 2007 at page 6). In support of the rejection the Examiner stated that moving an item from one folder to another suggests modifying an item via any item folder it belongs to. (See, e.g., *Id.* at page 6).

Applicants respectfully disagree and have amended to clarify the language of the claim. Claim 1 recites "each of said Items operable to belong to a plurality of Item Folders, wherein said Item Folders are themselves Items and said Items are configured to be *manipulated from* any Item Folder they belong to." Nelson neither teaches or suggests at least this claimed limitation. For example, and as the Examiner referred to, in Nelson "when an item's attributes are changed or the item is redefined ... the item is re-indexed" (Nelson Abstract), and, "the automatic linking system 10 will *move* documents from one folder to

another if the attributes are changed." (Nelson, col. 6, lines 8 – 9) (emphasis added). Or more specifically, the Item in Nelson can not exist in two different folders, let alone be manipulated from any file it is stored in. Applicants submit that moving an item from one folder to another is patentably distinct from items that can be manipulated from any Item Folder it belongs to. For example, "access to an Item may occur from different Item Folders, what is actually being accessed is in fact the very same Item." (Application at paragraph [0126]). Thus, "when an Item is accessed in one Item Folder and revised, this revised Item can then be accessed directly from another Item folder." (Application at paragraph [0126]). Applicants submit that since the combination of references neither teach or suggest all the claimed limitations, claim 1 patentably defines over Anglin, in view of Chang, Goodwin, and Nelson. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to claim 1.

Insomuch as claims 2 – 11, and 13 – 20 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 they too patentably define over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to claims 2 – 11, and 13 – 20.

Claim 21 recites similar elements to that of claim 1 and patentably defines over Anglin, in view of Chang, Goodwin, and Nelson for at least the same reason stated above with respect to claim 1. Insomuch as claims 23 – 25, 27 – 31, 33 – 36, depend directly or indirectly from claim 21 they too patentably define over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to claims 21, 23 – 25, 27 – 31, 33 – 36.

Claim 37 recites similar elements to that of claim 1 and patentably defines over Anglin, in view of Chang, Goodwin, and Nelson for at least the same reason stated above with respect to claim 1. Insomuch as claims 38 - 42, depend directly or indirectly from claim 21 they too patentably define over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to claims 37 – 42.

Claim 43 recites similar elements to that of claim 1 and patentably defines over Anglin, in view of Chang, Goodwin, and Nelson for at least the same reason stated above with respect to claim 1. Insomuch as claims 44 - 48, depend directly or indirectly from claim 21 they too patentably define over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to claims 43 – 48.

Claim 49 recites similar elements to that of claim 1 and patentably defines over Anglin, in view of Chang, Goodwin, and Nelson for at least the same reason stated above with respect to claim 1. Insomuch as claims 50 - 54, depend directly or indirectly from claim 21 they too patentably define over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to claims 49 - 54.

Claim 55 recites similar elements to that of claim 1 and patentably defines over Anglin, in view of Chang, Goodwin, and Nelson for at least the same reason stated above with respect to claim 1. Insomuch as claims 56 - 60, depend directly or indirectly from claim 21 they too patentably define over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to claims 55 - 60.

<div align="center">

CONCLUSION

</div>

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections to the claims and issue a Notice of Allowance of all pending claims.

Date: September 4, 2007

/David M. Platz/
David M. Platz
Registration No. 60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439